



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/717,894	11/21/2000	Karl-Heinz Buettgen	C 2109 COGG	2009

23657 7590 10/21/2002

COGNIS CORPORATION
2500 RENAISSANCE BLVD., SUITE 200
GULPH MILLS, PA 19406

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

MARX, IRENE

[REDACTED] ART UNIT 1651 PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 10/21/2002

10

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No. 09/717,894	Applicant(s) Buettgen et al.
Examiner Irene Marx	Art Unit 1651

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on Aug 17, 2002

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____

6) Other: _____

The amendment filed 8/27/02 is acknowledged. Claims 1-10 are being considered on the merits.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Gatfield et al.* taken with *Lepper et al.*

The claims are drawn to a method of treating a triglyceride with a lower alcohol with a lipase and treating the product again with a lower alcohol and lipase, thereby producing a product having a lower acid number.

Gatfield et al. disclose a method of treating the triglyceride, *Stillingia* oil, with the lower alkanol, ethanol, to intrinsically produce a pre-esterification product having a lower acid number. See, e.g., Example 2, wherein *C. antarctica* lipase is used. From *Lepper et al.* it can reasonably be concluded that the transesterification reaction of a triglyceride or oil with a short chain monoalcohol using a suitable catalyst will result in a product having a lower acid value. See, e.g., example 1, wherein coconut oil is reacted.

The *Gatfield et al.* reference differs from the invention as claimed in that the lipase is recycled to treat the original substrate rather than the pre-esterification product. However, it is clear from the reference that the lipase may be recycled. In addition, *Lepper et al.* teach a similar method, wherein an organic catalyst is used and wherein the pre-esterified product is subjected to further esterification with the alcohol (See, e.g., Example 1).

Thus, one of ordinary skill in the art would have reasonably expected at the time the claimed invention was made that the pre-esterification product could be subjected to further biotransformation using the lipase with similar results, since the reactions are substantially similar and differ only in the catalyst used.

As noted, the Lepper *et al.* reference uses coconut oil and in addition, Gatfield *et al.* disclose the suitability of coconut oil to produce pre-esterified products (See, e.g., col. 1, lines 55-60) and teaches the use lipase from *C. antarctica* for similar reactions (See, e.g., col. 2, line 10 and Example 2).

The references may further differ from the invention as claimed in specific parameters such as substrate, alcohol and lipase concentration. However, the optimization of conditions identified as result-effective variables cited in the references would have been prima facie obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to modify the process of Gatfield *et al.* by subjecting the pre-esterification product to further lipase treatment in the presence of ethanol or another alkanol for the expected benefit of maximizing the concentration of valuable esterified products and reducing the acid value of the mixture, as suggested by the teachings of Lepper *et al.*.

Thus, the claimed invention as a whole was clearly prima facie obvious, especially in the absence of evidence to the contrary.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive.

Applicant's argument that Gatfield does not teach the "direct esterification of free fatty acids with lower alkanols such as ethanol in the presence of an enzyme" is not understood, since the claims are directed to the esterification of a triglyceride with ethanol and an enzyme, as taught by the reference. It is uncertain what is meant by "direct" esterification in this context. The claims as written fail to exclude transesterification, since they are drafted in terms of the

open language "comprising". The arguments directed to "free fatty acids" in triglycerides appear misleading, since the fatty acids are bound to glycerol, for example.

Applicant's arguments regarding the unpredictability of enzymes in the esterification process taught by Lepper are noted. However, it is in the Gatfield reference that these teachings are found. Moreover, the arguments presented are inconsistent with the invention as claimed, directed to the use of any lipase, except for claim 8. The arguments are also inconsistent and contrary to the disclosure at Specification, bridging paragraph between pages 4 and 5. The Gatfield reference is relied upon because it recommends the use of precisely the same lipase as applicant uses in the Examples and in claim 8, i.e. the lipase from *Candida antarctica*, including NOVOZYM^R 435.

These arguments fail to demonstrate error in the Examiner's position that it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to modify the process of Gatfield *et al.* by subjecting the pre-esterification product to further lipase treatment in the presence of ethanol or another alkanol for the expected benefit of maximizing the concentration of valuable esterified products and reducing the acid value of the mixture, as suggested by the teachings of Lepper *et al.*.

Therefore the rejection is deemed proper and it is adhered to.

No claim is allowed.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Irene Marx whose telephone number is (703) 308-2922. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 6:30 AM to 3:00 PM.

Serial No. 09/717894
Art Unit 1651

-5-

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Wityshyn, can be reached on (703) 308-4743. The appropriate fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 305-3592, (703) 308-4242 and (703) 305-3014.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to Customer Service whose telephone number is (703) 308-0198 or the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1235.

Irene Marx
Irene Marx
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1651